

Appl. No. 10/757,778

Amdt. dated 24 January 2006

Reply to Restriction Requirement of 4 January 2006

### Remarks/Arguments

#### 1. Introduction

In response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement, Applicants elect to prosecute the species of the invention associated with Group A. It is believed all pending claims 1-17 read on this species. Further, Applicants have amended the claims to ensure that the pending claims comport with the provisions of 35 USC section 112, second paragraph. The Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to the claims, and incorporated by reference in any claims depending therefrom, are not narrowing amendments made for a reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent that will give rise to prosecution history estoppel. See *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

#### 2. Amendments to the Specification

To have a more definite and clearly defined invention, the Applicants have amended the written specification. No prior art necessitated these amendments and no new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.